FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 247

24 December 1985

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Editorial Article Examines Post-Summit Arms Stances AA 1
[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]
U.S. Shows 'Unwillingness' To Solve Arms Issues AA 3
[Bogachev]
'Moment of Truth' Arises in U.S. Arms Policy AA 4
[Korzin]
Speakes Announces U.S. Moratorium Refusal AA 5
Speakes Remarks Deplored AA 5
[Gan in PRAVDA 21 Dec]
U.S. Nuclear Explosion Postponed; Ban Deadline Near AA 7
[Magari]
U.S., Allies Hamper Progress at CDE Session AA 8
Possible Soviet Countermeasures to SDI Specified AA 8
[Morozov in TRUD 21 Dec]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Hungary's Lazar Interviewed on CEMA Program BB 1
[Lomko, Polekhin in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 21 Dec]
CEMA Standardization Body Meets in Berlin BB 2
[IZVESTIYA 22 Dec]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions and Answers' CC 1
[Pravdin, Krasikov, Levin]
PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events CC 2
[Kolesnichenko]
UN Debate on Session's 'Favorable' Results CC 6
NATO Secretary General 'Advertising' SDI CC 7
[Kudrin]
Pugwash Movement Statement to Reagan Reported CC 7

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Missing Soviet Scientist Reported in CIA Control A 1
[Krotov in IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]
Reagan Statement Confirms Priority of Arms Spending A 2
[Shalnev]
'Top Priority' Program Views Summit Results A 2
[Posner, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]
'Serious Obstacles' Exist in Joint TU Contacts A 6

CHINA

Reportage on Li Peng E. Europe, USSR Visits B 1
Visits CSSR, Bulgaria B 1
[PRAVDA 21 Dec]
Stopover in Moscow B 1
Meets Gorbachev B 1
Meets Talyzin, Departs B 2
Hijacked Soviet Passenger Plane Landed in PRC B 2
[AFP]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Talyzin Meets DPRK Foreign Trade Official C 1
[PRAVDA 22 Dec]
DPRK Vice President Makes Moscow Stopover C 1
[PRAVDA 23 Dec]
Light Industry Ministry Meets With DPRK Premier C 1
[IZVESTIYA 22 Dec]
Reportage on Kang Song-san Moscow Visit C 1
Visit Previewed C 1
Ryzhkov, Aliyev at Arrival C 2
Soviet-Japanese Fishing Commission Meets C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Shevardnadze Receives Indian Ambassador D 1
Indian Minister to Finalize Trade Accord D 1
[Delhi]
DRA Calls for 'Dialogue' to End Bloodshed [PRAVDA 22 Dec] D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Sokolov Greets SRV Counterpart on Army Jubilee E 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Dec]
PRAVDA Carries Lao Leaders' Message to USSR E 1
[22 Dec]

EASTERN EUROPE

Romanian Foreign Minister Pays Official Visit F 1
Met by Shevardnadze F 1
Begins Talks With Shevardnadze F 1
Talks Continue F 1
Relations Viewed F 2
Sokolov Greets SFRY's Mamula on Army Jubilee F 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Dec]

WESTERN EUROPE

Statement Given to UK Condemning SDI Participation G 1
PRAVDA Calls FRG Backing of SDI 'Fatal Step' G 1
[21 Dec]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

CPSU CC Greets Algerian Special Congress H 1
Lomeyko Denies Agreement on Arms to Iran, Iraq H 1
[KUNA]

EDITORIAL ARTICLE EXAMINES POST-SUMMIT ARMS STANCES

PM231630 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Living and Acting According to the Geneva Mandate"]

[Text] It is a month since the day the Geneva meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan ended. A considerable period -- according to the criteria of our swift-moving time. But the dialogue that was held on the shores of Lake Geneva still remains the center of world attention.

All peoples on earth awaited this dialogue with concern and hope. Have the expectations been vindicated? Even now, a month after the meeting, no simple answer can be asserted that the overall balance of Geneva is positive. Positive both for bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations and for the international situation as a whole.

At the same time, it has to be admitted that as of yet Geneva merely offers a chance of breaking the dangerous development of events in the world. It was not possible to find a solution beneath Swiss skies to the most important questions connected with the task of ending the arms race and consolidating peace. Major disagreements on fundamental issues still remain between the USSR and the United States. Above all, on issues connected with the security sphere, which, as the CPSU Central Committee Politburo stressed 25 November, is and will be the determining factor in Soviet-U.S. relations.

The nucleus of this sphere is the problem of preventing the militarization of space and of reducing nuclear weapons in their organic connection. When going to the Geneva summit the Soviet Union proposed to the United States, first of all, entirely banning space strike arms. Explaining its position on this issue, Moscow asserted and continues to assert that the creation of a space "shield" will make nuclear weapons even more dangerous. The entry into service [prinyatiye na vooruzheniye] of space strike means can only cause a new explosion of the arms race in all directions, transform the present strategic parity into strategic chaos, and sharply intensify the threat of a global nuclear conflict.

It would be criminally irresponsible to allow the military-political situation in the world to continue its slide toward the abyss. But the slide into uncontrollable confrontation will not stop spontaneously. A reliable barrier must be placed in its way.

Fulfilling its duty to mankind, our country is putting forward a profoundly well-reasoned, comprehensive, and, most importantly, realistic program for specific action.

The Soviet Union has proposed -- provided that there is a total ban on space strike arms -- that all the USSR's and the United States' existing nuclear means capable of reaching one another's territories be halved and that the total number of nuclear charges on them on each side be limited to a ceiling of 6,000 units. It was emphasized here that the Soviet side would regard the halving of the USSR's and the United States' nuclear means as the start of a process which could culminate -- and our country is ready for this (given that the other nuclear states join in this process too, of course) -- in the total destruction of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union also put forward proposals according, in the Soviet side's conviction, with the hopes of Europe's peoples for a lessening of the nuclear threat.

In one of the three spheres of the talks -- space, strategic offensive arms, and medium-range nuclear means -- is the USSR proposing anything that would reduce U.S. security.

Moreover, the Soviet Union's military doctrine has as one of its cornerstones the conscious renunciation of changing the strategic balance in its own favor and to the detriment of the United States, since the emergence of such a situation can only intensify the other side's suspiciousness and increase the instability of the overall situation in the world.

The USSR's consistent constructive policy made it possible to outline in Geneva some points of contact on the problem of preventing an arms race in space and curtailing it on earth. However, the main obstacle to resolving this fundamental issue -- the U.S. "star wars" program -- remains.

The month since Geneva has brought no indications of any changes in Washington's attitude to the "star wars" program. And, in turn, this does not make it possible to claim yet that the United States intends to be serious about the task whose resolution even R. Reagan proclaimed in Geneva to be one of the goals of U.S. foreign policy: preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth.

Moreover, the events of recent days create the firm impression that people on the banks of the Potomac intend to implement the "star wars" program at an accelerated pace, involving in it the scientific, technical, and industrial potential of their NATO allies -- Britain and the FRG -- and compelling Japan and other countries to become involved in implementing SDI. Thus, the attainment of the goal of the nonmilitarization of space is only complicated and the consequences of the transfer of the arms race to space -- which are already visible today, but have so far been confined to the sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations -- are beginning to take on global outlines.

The U.S. commitment -- proclaimed by President R. Reagan in Geneva -- to the abandonment of attempts to achieve superiority over the USSR in the military sphere as yet finds no corroboration in the question of ending nuclear weapons test.

Such a step by all the nuclear powers would contribute to the complete withering away of nuclear arsenals in the long term. It is precisely for this reason that the USSR unilaterally announced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions until 1 January 1986 in the hope that its example would be followed by other countries, above all, the United States. Given reciprocity on the part of Washington, our country is prepared to extend the moratorium.

But the United States is showing no readiness to join the Soviet Union. The United States prefers to improve nuclear weapons rather than eliminate them. And each successive nuclear explosion is further confirmation that Washington is preparing for "star wars" not "in order to destroy nuclear arsenals," but in order to strengthen its own first strike potential.

The U.S. Administration is still tempted to achieve military superiority. Empty ventures! It was reaffirmed with the utmost responsibility in Geneva that the USSR will not permit the United States to achieve military superiority over it; either on earth or in space.

Therefore, would it not be more sensible to use the current real chance to sharply lessen the threat of nuclear war and then, totally remove it? To miss this opportunity would be an irreparable mistake: Even today the arms race is increasing the degree of unpredictability of events and a further "technologization" [tekhnologizatsiya] of the means of waging war may take the possibility of a universal catastrophe out of the hands of reason altogether, leaving the peoples at the mercy of a semiconductor defect or a computer error.

Geneva still makes it possible to avoid such a catastrophe and still gives mankind a cance of surviving. That chance can and must be taken.

To that end it is necessary, first and foremost, to strictly adhere to the accords reached in Geneva, refraining from actions capable of making those accords merely an empty noise. Furthermore, it is necessary to take no actions capable in one way or another of blocking talks on nuclear and space arms. These talks themselves must really be talks aimed at achieving specific agreed goals and not a justification and camouflage of the arms race. The spirit of Geneva also demands honest and strict observance of the ABM Treaty and reciprocal observance by the sides of the provisions of the SALT II Treaty.

But the main thing is to create the possibility for really ending the arms race and finally embarking on practical steps to reduce nuclear arsenals. However must Soviet and U.S. proposals on these problems may differ, those differences are surmountable.

All these tasks, however, can be effectively resolved on one condition: if the door through which weapons can reach space is tightly closed. Otherwise, no radical nuclear arms reductions are possible.

Geneva opened up the way for the expansion and consolidation of Soviet-U.S. contacts, including at summit level. But a purely formal approach to the organization of such dialogues is impermissible. It is necessary to prepare for the next summit right now; primarily in the sphere of practical policy.

It is mainly a question of little things. It is necessary to mobilize political will and direct it toward turning words into deeds in order to respon with deeds to the peoples' aspirations. Courage is needed for a new and fresh approach to foreign policy which would ditch false, old-style conceptions of "national interests." It is necessary to become accustomed to strategic parity as the natural state of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The transition to the new positions dictated by the qualitatively new situation in the world is not simple, but it is necessary. "The acuteness of the times we are living through," M.S. Gorbachev stressed, "leaves Soviet and U.S. leaders and the Soviet and U.S. peoples with no alternative but to learn the great science of living together." Geneva issued a mandate for that science to be learned. Now we have only to start living and acting according to the Geneva mandate. The Soviet Union is prepared to do that.

U.S. SHOWS 'UNWILLINGNESS' TO SOLVE ARMS ISSUES

LD232010 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 23 Dec 85

["United States Is for Continuation of Nuclear Explosions" - TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

The summing up of the argumentation advanced by Washington in the past five years against the termination of nuclear weapon tests by the USA, the U.S. attitude to the moratorium on nuclear explosions give one a clearer notion of real aims of the foreign policy of the present U.S. Adminstration than all the speeches of its representatives about the need to make nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

The problem of nuclear weapon tests is the touchstone which exposes the real attitude of some or other government to the very idea of arms limitation and reduction through talks.

In July 1980, that is prior to the coming of the present administration to the White House, the U.S. delegation at the talks with the USSR and Britain signed a joint document which said, specifically, that the ban on nuclear tests in all the media will be a large contribution to the achievement of universal aims of checking the nuclear arms race. But in the same year of 1980, when the entire text of the future agreement was virtually agreed upon, the United States, without any explanation, unilaterally disrupted the talks on comprehensive test ban. And in July 1982 the present U.S. Administration announced that it does not intend to resume the talks in the foreseeable future.

After the Soviet Union, on August 6 of this year, announced unilaterally a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and urged the United States to follow suit, Washington came out with a statement that the existing means of verification of the observance of the ban on testing are allegedly not effective enough and ostentatiously held tests of a nuclear device at the range in Nevada.

Striving to get the question of the ban on nuclear tests off the ground, the Soviet Union recently proposed to the United States to take advantage of the consent of a number of states to the setting up in their territories of special stations for monitoring the implementation of the agreements and proclaimed its readiness, while establishing mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions, also to agree on certain measures of on-the-spot verification.

The United States which until recently was advancing on-the-spot verification as a term on which it can join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosion has now pulled back. They in Washington declared that solution of the problems of verification alone is not enough, that the United States can be discussing the termination of nuclear explosions only after the conclusion of the modernisation of U.S. nuclear weapon systems which need to be tested.

It is well-known that altogether the United States has staged the number of nuclear weapon tests that is at least one third greater than the number of tests by the Soviet Union. In conditions of the strategic balance between the USSR and the USA, the Pentagon's intention to continue nuclear tests unilaterally shows only that contrary to its declarations the White House has not given up the aim of achieving military superiority.

It is not for the first time in the past five years that Washington has shown the United States unwillingness to decide the problems of removing the danger of nuclear war, has shown that, just like a gambleer, it continued to disregard vital interests of all peoples, including the American people.

'MOMENT OF TRUTH' ARISES IN U.S. ARMS POLICY

LD232315 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1944 GMT 23 Dec 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] As in peoples' lives, moments arrive in the lives of states and governments when words start losing their meaning and what is needed are deeds, specific decisions of principle. Such a moment has arrived in the mutual relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The moment of truth is here. Mayakovskiy remarked in his time that words get shabby with use just like a suit. If one were to count all the repetitions of the allegedly peace-loving statements made in Washington, then it becomes clear that the ideological wardrobe has not only grown shabby, but has already become simply worn out. The hopes which mankind put on the meeting in Geneva boiled down to a constructive approach to halting the arms race being outlined. We justified these hopes. You know, comrades, that the Soviet Union has come forward with a number of business-like proposals, intelligible to all.

One of these concerns nuclear blasts. We unilaterally announced a moratorium on any nuclear tests, giving the other side almost 6 months for reflection. It would seem simple and clear -- we would not test weapons, there would be no new types of weapons either. We have not carried out a single test since the beginning of August, when the moratorium was announced, to the present day. Despite the fact that the earth continued to shake with explosions from testing in the State of Nevada, we believed that common sense would nevertheless prevail.

However, puffs of verbal smoke are again dispersing from Washington, which are aimed at masking the administration's unwillingness to respond to the Soviet Union's initiative. Deputy White House press secretary Speakes, in essence rejecting our proposal, made a statement from which it follows that the question of halting nuclear blasts cannot be solved, until a fundamental reduction of nuclear arsenals on both sides is achieved.

The world has already been a witness many times to how the constructive approaches of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have come up against reservations and unacceptable conditions. It seems that yet another example of such an approach is at hand. We made a proposal to the U.S. President on a moratorium in order to demonstrate the mutual striving of both countries toward ending the arms race. A first step is necessary in any matter. A joint ban on nuclear tests could be such a step, could give a real impulse to the whole process of Soviet-U.S. talks.

SPEAKES ANNOUNCES U.S. MORATORIUM REFUSAL

LD231450 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 23 Dec 85

["USA Refuses to Introduce Moratorium" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, December 23 TASS -- As was already reported, a few days ago deputy press secretary of the White House Larry Speakes at his press conference answered in the negative to the Soviet proposal of a moratorium on any nuclear explosions.

From Larry Speakes' pronouncements it is clear that the question of a moratorium, even more so, termination of nuclear tests, cannot be resolved until a substantial reduction of nuclear arsenals on both sides is attained. Such an argument, if one may call it so, is at least strange. If this logic is to be followed, even relatively simple things, such as for instance, a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions, would be postponed for an uncertain period of time.

The aim of the Soviet Union's address to the U.S. President on the question of the moratorium was to demonstrate the real and mutual intention of the USSR and the USA to lead things to a halt in the nuclear arms race. There are no really weighty reasons for the two countries, the Soviet Union and the USA, not to undertake a joint step -- to stop nuclear explosions. That would be a tangible step which would surely give a strong impetus to the whole process of negotiations on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva. It would be to the personal credit of the leaders of the two countries to solve that issue.

Speakes Remarks Deplored

PM231110 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "Who Is Against the Moratorium? L. Speakes: White House 'Disagrees'; Public Alarmed"]

[Text] Washington, 20 Dec -- As is well known, a camera obscura is a device which gives a distorted view of a subject.

It seems that the principle of its operation is very popular in Washington. It has again been put into action here in order to confuse U.S. public opinion and mask the administration's reluctance to make concrete efforts to stop the nuclear arms race.

White House spokesman L. Speakes received a hail of questions from journalists at today's press conference. Launching into unsubstantiated claims about the United States' "long-standing desire" to limit nuclear tests, Speakes turned everything upside down, to put it mildly. It followed from what he said that Washington dreams only of "setting in motion a process which could strengthen trust and cooperation between the two countries as regards limitations on nuclear tests" and that this is the administration's "long-term goal."

As for the specific question of joining the USSR's unilateral moratorium, the response was unambiguous -- the United States "disagrees."

The motive behind the Washington position he set out is no secret. And Speakes did not consider it possible to hide the fact that the U.S. refusal to introduce a ban on nuclear tests is explained by its intention to continue building up and improving the U.S. nuclear arsenal. The White House spokesman just stated: "U.S. tests are needed to ensure the effectiveness of our means of deterrence and to ensure the reliability" of U.S. nuclear arsenals.

Moreover, according to Speakes, the Pentagon needs to carry out nuclear explosions in order to expedite the highly dangerous "star wars" program. As THE WASHINGTON POST wrote the other day, it is a question of the development [razrabotka] of nuclear devices which it is planned to deploy in low earth orbit.

"In my opinion, the Soviet Union is absolutely right to offer to introduce a joint moratorium with the United States on nuclear tests, which would help prevent the militarization of space," Admiral G. LaRocque, retired, director of the prestigious Center for Defense Information, stated in conversation with your correspondent. "The USSR's readiness to extend the moratorium is a most important act and one can only regret that the administration refuses to support it and refuses to take the opportunity to take a substantial step in slowing the arms race."

The well-known specialist categorically rejected the White House "arguments" according to which the system of verification is "inadequate." "The references to monitoring difficulties are groundless; the existing means make it possible to monitor the fulfillment of accords with total certainty," LaRocque pointed out. Moreover, he noted, the USSR -- and this is very important -- is prepared to reach agreement with the United States on certain onsite monitoring measures. Thus, in his words, it is "politics and by no means technology that is the major stumbling block for the United States in reaching new agreements with the Soviet Union." The U.S. excuses, the director of the center said, are being used to camouflage a reluctance to take vitally important steps.

The Center for Defense Information in the person of its director is by no means alone in this opinion. When asked to comment on the administration's stance, T. (Ferrer), a leader of the mass social organization "Nuclear Freeze Campaign," stated: We are very disappointed that our government has not made a positive response to the Soviet proposal. That is truly tragic. We are missing an historic opportunity to stop the arms race by supporting the constructive Soviet position. Washington's actions mean that the peace-loving Americans throughout the country, will continue the active struggle to ban nuclear tests.

In other words, the progressive U.S. public is frankly disenchanted with the administration's stance, which is blatantly at odds with the imperative of the time and the demands of universal security and peace.

Now that political will is so necessary in order to progress down the road of taking concrete measures to curb the arms race and implementing the positive results of the Geneva summit, Washington is showing its lack of such will. Yet, as sober-minded Americans believe, it is the removal of tension and the military threat, not the creation of demagogic "smokescreens," that accords with the aspirations of all the peoples, including the American people.

U.S. NUCLEAR EXPLOSION POSTPONED; BAN DEADLINE NEAR

LD212144 Moscow TASS in English 2141 GMT 21 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 21 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Magari writes:

According to reports that from the United States, an underground nuclear explosion planned for December 19, during which a nuclear-pumped laser was to be used, has been put off. This fact draws the attention, above all, for the reason that the deadline of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions imposed on August 6 expires on January 1. The moratorium, however, might be prolonged if the United States joins in it.

Regrettably, there were no such signs from the United States till now. References were made, specifically, to difficulties of verification, though it is well known that both the Soviet Union and the United States have quite perfect national technical means which can reliably ensure the confidence of the sides that the moratorium is observed.

For purposes of enhancing effective control, the Soviet side suggested making use of the proposal of six states -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- for setting up on their territories special tracking stations for observance over the implementation of arrangements on the cessation of tests.

The Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. It wishes, while establishing mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions now, to agree with the United States also on some measures for on-the-spot verification to remove possible doubts about the observance of such a moratorium.

As is justly recognized by many observers, these proposals opened up practical possibilities for a mutually acceptable solution of the question of mutual moratorium.

So what does the United States decision to put off an underground nuclear explosion mean? Is it a response to the recent Soviet proposals on verification? If so, then the possibility to get off the ground the solution of the problem of nuclear tests assumes real outlines. This is why that fact has not passed unnoticed. Many would like to see in it the sign of hope that the voice of reason starts prevailing among those who are shaping the United States nuclear policy. If the United States really intends to join in the moratorium it could become a good augury for the coming year 1986.

U.S., ALLIES HAMPER PROGRESS AT CDE SESSION

LD201230 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Stockholm, December 20 TASS -- TASS special correspondents Nikolay Vukolov and Aleksandr Stepanenko write:

The scheduled session of the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has closed in the Swedish capital today. Its results can be evaluated as positive on the whole, said Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation. The recent Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva has had a positive impact on the session in Stockholm. The atmosphere at the conference has become more business-like, a range of questions has been outlined that could make the contours of a future agreement, coordinators have been named for drafting the final document.

The main trends in the work of the Stockholm forum are determined by the proposals of the socialist countries, which provide both for concrete commitment on non-use of force and confidence-building measures in the military field.

At the same time, the USA and some of its allies are hampering progress. They are preventing the effort to make concrete and effective the principle of non-use of force and outline measures for the notification on exercises of such strike arms of the service as the air force and the navy in the sea (oceanic) area and airspace adjoining Europe.

POSSIBLE SOVIET COUNTERMEASURES TO SDI SPECIFIED

PM211603 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Dec 85 p 3

["Political observer's notes" by Colonel V. Morozov, USSR State Prize Winner: "Space Must be Peaceful"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is persistently struggling for the elimination of the threat looming over mankind of a world nuclear conflagration and by its specific peace proposals and initiatives is seeking to open the way to the solution of the most important questions connected with ending the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race. This consistent, peace-loving Leninist policy has won our country high praise among the world's peoples.

A situation has now formed whereby the position taken by Washington on the "star wars" issue has become the main obstacle in the path to an agreement on arms control and the reduction of nuclear arsenals. What are the "star wars" plans which the U.S. leadership is elaborating and which are concealed behind the shelf of the "strategic defense initiative" (SDI)?

SDI is the U.S. Administration's latest illusory gamble for achieving military superiority over the USSR. It provides for the creation [sozdaniye] of an all-embracing (total) ABM system on earth and in space allegedly capable of fully guaranteeing the destruction of Soviet missiles and spacecraft and thereby creating conditions for delivering a first nuclear strike with impunity. The calculations are based on the possibility of disarming the other side and depriving it of the capability of delivering an inevitable retaliatory counterstrike while resorting to nuclear strategic and space weapons against military targets, cities, and regions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Those are the true designs of the SDI authors. They are dreams as overt as they are pernicious: to subordinate the world to their rule on the basis of a bellicose philosophy -- he who is first in space will be first on earth.

The Soviet arguments showing all the dangers of Washington's "star wars" program were convincingly set forth at the meeting with President R. Reagan and at the Geneva press conference. The Soviet Union hopes that what was said in Geneva about SDI was not the U.S. side's last word.

Unfortunately, to all appearances Washington is in no hurry to draw the appropriate conclusions in the spirit of the January accord and the Soviet-U.S. statement in Geneva and is taking no practical steps to halt the arms race on earth and prevent it in space. SDI will not be a "bargaining chip" at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments, the U.S. President said recently in Fallston (Maryland) in a speech in which he again returned to the results of the Geneva meeting.

As we can see from recent U.S. press reports, the U.S. military-industrial complex and the Washington administration officials who express its interests are accelerating efforts aimed at the militarization of a space. The Pentagon has already submitted contracts for the production of elements of space system under the SDI program to a number of the country's largest military-industrial corporations. They include well-known firms like McDonnell Douglas astronomics company, Lockheed, Boeing, Rockwell, Hughes, Litton, and others.

At the recent U.S. congressional hearings on SDI it was established that the cost of the "star wars" program is expressed in very large sums: Expenditure on "research" work alone over 6 years will total $33 billion while the deployment of the entire space system will cost many trillions of dollars.

This is a reality which must be seen and taken into account and the Soviet Union does take it into account, above all by persistently urging the United States to abandon this extremely dangerous undertaking. At the same time, it is stating its resolve to respond fittingly to Washington's "space" challenge if its program for the militarization of space, counter to reason, is implemented. This was again mentioned authoritatively by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from the rostrum of the Fourth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Noting the fact that the United States is continuing its course toward achieving military superiority, he said: "...In undertaking an arms race in space, they are thinking to overtake us in electronics and computers. But, as has already frequently been the case in the past, we will find an answer. And an effective, sufficiently swift, and perhaps less expensive answer than the U.S. program."

In what direction could Soviet retaliatory steps be taken? There are perfectly real and highly effective methods for this. The Soviet Union has absolutely no need to choose the path along which the Washington politicians and strategists "suggest" it travel, that is the path of creating its own wide-scale and expensive ABM defense. Academician Ye. P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, addressing the USSR Supreme Soviet session, said: "We do not intend to help the Americans in their aggressive intentions or to sit with folded arms. It is with a sense of profound responsibility, based on a knowledge of the thrust of the matter, that I would like to confirm that Soviet science and design thinking will ensure effective countermeasures economically and rapidly. I stress once more: Soviet science even in the past has very rapidly resolved the most difficult problems and will resolve them now..."

To speak specifically, one can point to the following, simplest option. This is the method of active resistance to the space ABM system the United States is creating. It is prompted by Soviet scientists who have revealed and analyzed the entire spectrum of potential means capable of substantially neutralizing the space ABM system as one of the components designed to secure for the United States the possibility of delivering a first disarming strike with impunity.

The reality of the effective use of this method, among other retaliatory measures, is linked with the fact that the space-based ABM system which is being created in the United States is planned as a highly automated system with a large number of various sensitive elements. For that reason, it will already be very vulnerable and unstable. To neutralize and invalidate this system the retaliating side could use, for instance, so-called space mines, obstacles in the trajectories of space combat stations, phony rocket launchings, various coatings reflecting laser radiation, and other means.

It is perfectly obvious that this effective network of countermeasures could be created more rapidly, using to a considerable extent the technology which is already available, than the wide-scale U.S. system which lays claim to a supreme degree of efficiency. The calculations made by Soviet scientists show that the system of reliable countermeasures could also be substantially cheaper than a system deployed on the basis of implementation of Washington's SDI program. For instance, it has been calculated that the cost of an effective countersystem could be no more than 1-2 percent of the cost of a wide-scale ABM system.

There is another, even more effective, method of restoring the disrupted military-strategic equilibrium in the event of the deployment of a U.S. space-based ABM defense system. It provides for an increase in the quantity and improvement in the quality of Soviet offensive armaments (their effectiveness, accuracy, and yield) so they can overcome the comprehensive U.S. ABM defense and neutralize and thus invalidate the "star wars" electronic space machinery it is creating.

Naturally, these two options could be combined.

Finally, we well remember the year of 1941 and we have learned from its bitter experience. Today the USSR's material potential and scientific-technical potential are such that our country, if necessary, is quite realistically capable of responding to the United States just as it intends to threaten us from space. "And surely the Americans will not feel more comfortable if our weapons are added to the echelons of space armaments which Washington is planning in space?" M.S. Gorbachev has asked. Answering this question, he said: "After all, the United States cannot hope to have a monopoly in space. This is all frivolous at the very least."

The question now arises intensely: Is space to be or not to be peaceful? The USSR is not to blame for the fact that it has arisen. It was put on the agenda of world politics by the present U.S. Administration by embarking on the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike weapons capable of resolving strictly offensive tasks. It is perfectly obvious to all sober-minded people that the implementation of Washington's "star wars" program will inevitably lead to the appearance of space weapons. That will mean that in the arms race mankind will cross the dangerous point of no return. That is why the problem of preventing the militarization of space has now acquired paramount importance. The futher development of the entire military-political situation in the world and ultimately, the destiny of mankind depend on its solution.

HUNGARY'S LAZAR INTERVIEWED ON CEMA PROGRAM

PM231639 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 Dec 85 p 3

[Special correspondents Ya. Lomko and A. Polekhin interview with G. Lazar, chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, under the rubric "Facts of Integration": "Prospects of Cooperation" -- date and place not given]

[Text] The report has come from Budapest that at a meeting held here the Hungarian Government approved the report by G. Lazar, chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, on the 41st (extraordinary) sitting of the CEMA session in Moscow and on the Comprehensive Program for the CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress up to the year 2000 which it adopted.

SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA special correspondents Ya. Lomko and A. Polekhin asked Comrade G. Lazar, chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, to answer a number of questions in connection with the CEMA session held in Moscow.

[Lomko/Polekhin] The documents adopted attest to the unanimous decision of the CEMA countries to develop extensive cooperation with the aim of speeding up scientific and technical progress. In which areas of the adopted Comprehensive Program can Hungary, in your opinion, make the most significant contribution to this fraternal cooperation?

[Lazar] From the very outset, the MSZMP Central Committee and the Hungarian Government have supported the initiative of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which is aimed at speeding up fulfillment of the decision taken by the CEMA summit meeting concerning the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. The main tasks of the Comprehensive Program now adopted on the whole coincide with the special purpose aims of speeding up the development of the Hungarian national economy. This is also conducive to the fact that we can take vital part in implementation of the Comprehensive Program in the sphere of electronification, in particular in the development of medical equipment and systems for the electronification of agriculture, and in the development and production of auxiliary equipment for geophysical research on land and at sea, and also some types of equipment used in the nuclear industry to be a similar sphere. Hungary is interested in the joint development and application of biotechnological processes in some spheres of plant growing, livestock breeding, and the pharmaceutical industry.

[Lomko/Polekhin] Developed capitalist countries in the West, and the United States in particular, are making every possible effort to restrict scientific and technical exchange with socialist countries and are attempting to prevent the sale of the latest technology and equipment to them. To what extent does the approved Comprehensive Program make these effforts of theirs futile?

[Lazar] CEMA countries, including Hungary, consider scientific and technical progress to be an important factor of economic development and cooperation, in which they have already achieved significant results. The Comprehensive Program acquires great importance in this sphere, because it serves the intensive development of our countries. At the same time, implementation of the program will help to increase the reliability of our plans and reduce the degree of technical and economic dependence on the capitalist countries in the conditions of their trade restrictions. Attaining a higher level of technical progress in various spheres will also assist better participation by our countries in the international division of labor.

[Lomko/Polekhin] Some bourgeois information organs in Western countries are already attempting to present the matter in such a way as if the adopted document is a response to the SDI project. What is your attitude toward such comments?

[Lazar] As early as June 1984, the summit meeting adopted the decision that our countries would work out a Comprehensive Program of Scientific and Technical Progress in the interests of speeding up the implementation of our plans. For the purpose of total clarity I would like to note that, unlike SDI, which is a military strategic system, the Comprehensive Program serves the peaceful aims of civil production, raising the standard of living, and the aims of our economic development. That is obviously, that the Comprehensive Program we have adopted proceeds from the objective laws of our development.

CEMA STANDARDIZATION BODY MEETS IN BERLIN

PM231444 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "CEMA Diary"]

[Text] Berlin, 21 Dec -- A routine session of the CEMA Standing Commission on Cooperation in the Sphere of Standardization has been held here. Delegations from the CEMA countries and the SFRY took part in its work.

On the basis of the decisions of the CEMA countries' economic summit the session defined joint measures for assessing the quality of goods on the basis of CEMA standards. At the same time the commission outlined steps aimed at implementing the provisions of the Comprehensive Program for the CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000, which was adopted at the 41st (extraordinary) sitting of the CEMA Session.

Other measures to step up the national economic effectiveness of international standardization within the CEMA framework were discussed.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD201915 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 20 Dec 85

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by foreign policy commentator Sergey Pravdin, with interaational affairs journalists Anatoliy Krasikov and Viktor Levin]

International Relations

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] How did relations within the world community as a whole develop during the past year?

[Krasikov] Well, it must be said that complications continue. Unfortunately, all the seats of international tension that arose during the preceding years remain. I have in mind, primarily, such regions as the Near East, Central America, southern Africa, and also many other points of the globe. The situation, unfortunately, is not getting any brighter as the leading country in the West, the United States, does not at all wish to give up its policy of force, or its attempts to impose on all countries and peoples a policy which is to Washington's liking.

But the most important and most acute questions which have worried, and continue to worry, the whole of mankind during the past year were and remain the questions of disarmament and strengthening international security.

Nuclear Test Moratorium

[Pravdin] The USSR is doing everything possible to strengthen peace and to avert the threat of nuclear war. In this connection, it is necessary to particularly stress the importance of the USSR's unilateral decision to establish a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Our listeners, as is shown by letters and telephone calls to the editorial office, have shown great interest in the report on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with Bernard Lown, U.S. cochairman of the international movement, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. As is known, during this meeting the U.S. professor gave a high assessment of the USSR's peaceful initiatives and, in particular, of the moratorium on all nuclear explosions announced on 6 August this year. The cessation of nuclear explosions, Lown said, is in accord with the hopes of all people.

Our regular listeners Mikhail Pavlovich Karshanov, and the Morzheyedov family from Moscow have written to the editorial office asking about what importance the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons would have. All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Levin replies to this question.

[Levin] First of all, I would like to remind you that when it introduced its moratorium on nuclear explosions on 6 August, the USSR appealed to the United States to follow our example. Our moratorium remains in effect until 1 January. During his conversation with Bernard Lown, Comrade Gorbachev said that we were ready to continue the moratorium that had been introduced by the USSR on nuclear explosions if the United States responded with reciprocity. Very little time remains until 1 January, but the unique opportunity to make the moratorium bilateral and to continue it further remains. To allow this chance to pass by, and here we come to the significance of the cessation. of nuclear weapon testing, would mean refusing to enter upon the path leading toward a final treaty banning all testing of nuclear weapons.

Consequently the USSR, and not only our country -- and one can say with complete certainty the whole world community -- I would remind you that a few days ago the UN General Assembly almost unanimously, with only three votes against -- and these were the votes of the United States, Britain and France -- adopted a resolution on the immediate cessation and banning of nuclear weapon tests. Thus, the USSR and the whole world community regard the moratorium on nuclear explosions as a step toward a total ban on nuclear weapon testing.

Now let us turn to the question of what mankind would obtain if nuclear explosions are stopped. Here, one should recall that an understanding was reached long ago between the USSR, the United States, and Britain on ceasing nuclear tests in three spheres: on the ground, under water, and in space. The USSR, in introducing a moratorium on carrying out nuclear explosions, proceeded from the genuine striving to make a real and concrete step along the path of improving the international political climate, along the path of strengthening peace. We took this step and the international public assessed it at its true worth. However, now, for the moratorium to be prolonged, what is needed is a similar decision from the United States. Our side is expected from the U.S. leadership a concrete and positive reply. Such a reply would have an extremely favourable influence on the whole situation.

Persian Gulf

[Pravdin] Our regular listener from Moscow Zinaida Mikhaylovna Nikolayeva asks us to speak about Oman and the other countries of the Persian Gulf. Why do the United States and the other imperialist powers display increased interest in this region, the writer asks.

Lately, the situation in that region has become considerably more acute in connection with the expansion of the Iran-Iraq war, which the United States is trying in every way to use as a direct pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of the Persian Gulf nations. In an attempt to strengthen their security, the states of that region, including Oman, are trying to conduct a more balanced foreign policy. Thus, for example, some time ago Sultan Qabus of Oman normalized his relations with the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, relations that had been extremely tense for many years. An understanding was also reached on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Oman. By the way, other countries of that region are striving to develop their relations with the USSR. Last month the USSR and the United Arab Emirates signed an agreement on the exchange of diplomatic representatives. Our country has full-scale state relations with Kuwait. The progressive Arab press considers the expansion of links between the countries of the Persian Gulf and the USSR will strengthen the international position and prestige of the Persian Gulf nations.

PRAVDA REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM221613 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[Tomas Kolensichenko "International Review"]

[Text] Not Letting the Chance Slip By

Each departing year submits itself to a trial by history, as it were. How has it served human civilization, what values has it introduced to the common coffer of social, spiritual, and political progress?

The future will pass its verdict. But there are events whose importance and magnitude are visible not only from a distance. They are comprehensible today, if only because they are directed toward the future itself and shape it.

It is now, when breakthroughs are being made into new fields of human knowledge and the frontier of the 21st century is approaching inexorably, that problems of pooling the efforts of different countries to use revolutionary advances in science, equipment, and technology in the interests of peace and man's progress, for the benefit of all peoples are arising particularly keenly in their specific practical basis. [sentence as published]

As for the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, they have been and remain firm and consistent champions of this course. An example is the CEMA countries' Comprehensive Program of Scientific-Technical Progress Through the Year 2000 adopted in Moscow at the 41st (extraordinary) CEMA session. The socialist community countries are pooling their efforts in the effective use of the potential opened up by the scientific-technical revolution on the basis of the advantages which the socialist system possesses.

It is highly important to note that the program which has been adopted is a program of peaceful creation for the sake of man, that it stems from the very essence of socialism. Here we do not seek to create a kind of provileged club of states with a monopoly on the latest scientific-technical achievements. The socialist countries, in strengthening their unity, come out in the international arena with a constructive large-scale program aimed at halting the senseless arms race, preventing the militarization of space, and implementing in practice the accords of the Geneva summit meeting. There is not a single respectable mass media organ in the world today which has failed to note this idea stemming from the documents adopted at the CEMA extraordinary session.

Pondering over how the departing year could be crowned and the new year greeted, people throughout the world are now turning their eyes and thoughs toward the Soviet initiatives aimed at limiting and ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons which threaten life itself on earth. As is well known, the unilateral Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions expires 1 January. But as M.S. Gorbachev recently confirmed, if the moratorium becomes mutual, if the United States associates itself to it, then it will be extended beyond 1 January 1986. A joint Soviet-U.S. moratorium on any nuclear explosions would be a major milestone on the path toward eliminating the nuclear peril. This is a unique chance. And it must not be allowed to slip away.

When talk turns to the moratorium, some people in the West, especially in the United States, immediately put forward objections connected with the fact that it is allegedly very difficult to monitor and therefore has no real point. Of course, these are all excuses, because even nonspecialists already know of the existence of reliable national means making it possible to monitor any nuclear explosions. Incidentally, the Americans were convinced of this not so long ago, when they carried out an undeclared small-yield nuclear explosion. It was recorded immediately.

But to advance this problem from a standstill with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of monitoring, the Soviet side -- special note must be made of this -- supported the idea of using an international system of verification. Moreover, the Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. It is in favor, if a mutual moratorium is established now on nuclear explosions, on reaching agreement with the United States on several on-the-spot monitoring measures. This step would definitively remove any doubts about the observance of this moratorium after which the actual problem of monitoring could not longer viewed as an obstacle on the path of a mutual agreement.

How is Washington reacting to the Soviet initiative? Instead of an explicit and positive reply, a negative reaction is issuing from it. Here a certain nervous confusion is to be noted, because the United States has now been compelled to justify itself to the whole world without having any real arguments.

How else to assess the extensive statements at a press conference by White House spokesman L. Speakes, who was like a cat on a hot tin roof in front of journalists? On the one hand he assured those present of the administration's adherence to the "process of cooperation" between the United States and the USSR on the question of halting nuclear tests yet on the other he frankly stated: The United States is opposed to a moratorium. Here he scaled "pinnacles" of logic which baffled hard-bitten jouranlists.

While "welcoming" the Soviet position on monitoring, Speaks at the same time said that "this question is, however, a separate question from the moratorium on nuclear explosions." But how can that be so? After all it was none other than the U.S. side which constantly asserted that it was the question of monitoring which was the pivotal issue of a moratorium and that until it was resolved it was impossible to reach an agreement. But now that the monitoring problem is entirely soluble, Washington is rejecting its own words and arguments.

Of course, the point lies somewhere else. The United States simply does not want to abandon the buildup of nuclear weapons. And for that it needs tests. Even Washington admits that. "The tests carried out by the United States," the U.S. capital has declared, "are necessary to be sure of preserving the effectiveness of our deterrent potential and to be sure of the reliability and security of U.S. arsenals while we actively engage in research into the technologies which will one day reduce our dependence on offensive armaments. Nuclear arms will remain in the foreseeable future the key element of our deterrent potential. In a situation where the United States and our allies must rely on nuclear arms with a view to curbing aggression, nuclear tests are needed."

"Curbing aggression" -- that is propaganda cover. But the thrust of the problem can still be seen. After all, "research into technologies" is nothing other than the "star wars" program. The United States is thus planning to put strike weapons into space while at the same time building up its ground-based offensive nuclear arsenals.

Washington's position has given rise to a stormy reaction throughout the world. "Washington is simply resorting to propaganda maneuvering," the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN writes indignantly, noting that "the conclusion of a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear tests is most necessary."

Just days remain to the new year. Are nuclear tests to be or not to be? A question which now perturbs all mankind. And if the U.S. Administration wants to heed that voice there is still time.

The Feeding Trough and the Mousetrap

In the capitalist countries the fruit of the scientific-technical revolution are put at the service of the ruling forces' selfish interests. They "work" not for peace but for war, intensifying the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Here the United States and its allies, using various embargoes and lists of "prohibited" goods and other restrictions, are essentially waging a technological war against the socialist world. Their cherished aim is to isolate the socialist countries from modern scientific and technical achievements and to delay their economic development. And they themselves want to accomplish a technological breakthrough, to "break loose," to forge ahead, and disrupt the military-strategic parity in their favor.

In that sense the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," in other words the "star wars" program which the United States is nurturing, is a classic example. Whatever the "defensive" clothing in which its authors dress the SDI, it remains what it really is -- a program for putting into space destructive weapons which, under cover of a "shield," it is planned to use to deliver a first strike. (after all, in propagandizing SDI as a "defensive weapon," the Pentagon has not abandoned a single so-called "offensive" weapons program through the year 2000. It is for their development and interaction with SDI that the Pentagon intends to continue these same nuclear tests).

That is the aim for which the United States intends to use the fruit of the scientific-technical revolution, the most sophisticated technological achievements, and scientific ideas and inventions. That is why X-ray and chemical lasers, particle beam weapons, electromagnetic guns, weapons based on kinetic energy, orbital mirrors, and other unprecedented means of destruction are being developed. Here Washington is operating on the "don't spare the ammunition" principle. Nor the money. As U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, which is very well informed on these issues, notes, "the 'star wars' project is now on the way to becoming the biggest feeding trough in the history of scientific research... According to preliminary estimates, SDI, which is geared to 30 years, could require $1 trillion. Even now, the 'smell of cooking' has attracted defense subcontractors, university laboratories, and high-technology industry [tekhnikoyemkoy promyshlennosti] firms." They all want to grab their share of this gigantic sum. The so-called "research" projects, according to reports in TIME magazine, have already been seized by 20 large firms, 200 smaller firms, and a dozen universities.

This also creates social problems. An increasing number of the best engineering and technical and scientific cadres in the United States are working for the monopolies of the military-industrial complex which dominates the U.S. economy. "The problem now," THE WASHINGTON POST notes, "is to prevent U.S. culture from being turned into a completely militarized culture." In this connection the newspaper directly asks: "Has it not turned out that the U.S. military industry has acquired such influence that it has begun to determine foreign policy instead of serving it?"

The question hits the nail on the head, as they say. Let's recall just the concept of the "window of vulnerability." It became firmly established in the Republicans' vocabulary when they began the attack against President Carter in the struggle for the White House, accusing him of "closing this window" [as published] by allegedly surrendering "military superiority" to the Soviet Union. For years this myth was used to intimidate taxpayers and to justify the Pentagon's mounting expenditure. After all, it has been calculated that ... $2 trillion have flown through this mythical "window." And not just anywhere but straight into the safes of the military-industrial complex, which it so happens had a hand in creating this myth. Military business even now is continuing to fuel it. The "window of vulnerability," it claims, has still not been closed. This recently gave rise to a heartfelt cry for Congressman Les Aspin (a Democrat from Wisconsin): "$2 trillion have been spent and the 'window of vulnerability' is still there. People! What have they done with the money?"

If you look at the international aspect of SDI, the whole thrust of the U.S. inequitable, great-power approach toward its allies is revealed here. On the one hand Washington is seeking to involve its "younger brothers" in NATO in the "star wars" program. But by no means to bestow sophisticated technology on them.

The Americans have a saying: "The only free cheese is in a mousetrap." Washington does not conceal the fact that all the scientific-technical achievements connected with SDI will remain under strict U.S. control while its allies have been prepared the fate of subcontractors, of "technological slaves."

And it is perfectly easy to understand the reaction of French President F. Mitterrand, who stated recently that he refuses to join in the implementation of the military space plan which "will in fact lead only to the intensification of international tension and put France in a subordinate position."

Only Britain, linked by "special interests," has attached itself to the U.S. SDI program (on the pretext of taking part in "research" work) and, as the press calls it, "the best student in the American school" -- Bonn. FRG Chancellor H. Kohl recently pushed through government the decision that FRG firms will take part in SDI. But even this "victory" may prove a Pyrrhic one. The broadest public circles are opposing "star wars" increasingly vigorously. In the FRG these include the Social Democrats, the Greens, the Communists, and other opposition circles. Nor is everything in harmony on this question among the ruling coalition. U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz was obviously dispatched to help the chancellor. He demanded that the Europeans stop hesitating and immediately associate themselves to the "star wars" plans, that is put their heads in the mousetrap which Washington calls the "defense initiative." Meanwhile, while G. Shultz was touring Europe, across the ocean, in his homeland, matters had not taken shape quite as the secretary of state and entire administration would have liked. For instance, in Washington recently the problems of reducing nuclear armaments were discussed by a group of specialists including several former government officials who had taken part in talks with the USSR. As the newspaper THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER notes, "all those taking part in the discussion of the question reached the unanimous opinion that the main obstacle to a new agreement (on strategic arms limitations -- T.K.) is President Reagan's adherence to the 'star wars' program which provides for the creation of an ABM defense system." A radical reduction of nuclear weapons which can reach the territories of the USSR and the United States is possible only on condition that space strike weapons are banned.

A month has elapsed since the Geneva meeting. A crucial period has now arrived. It is a case of practical deeds, of not undermining but developing everything useful achieved in Geneva. The Soviet leadership, as has been stated, is prepared to advance along this path. But this is not a one-way street. And we have the right to count on the same approach being displayed by the U.S. leadership. This would accord with the interests not only of the USSR and the United States but also of the entire world community.

UN DELEGATE ON SESSION'S 'FAVORABLE' RESULTS

LD190911 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Dec 85

[Text] The UN General Assembly is completing its discussion of the whole range of questions of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. Our correspondent asked the USSR's permanent representative at the United Nations, Comrade Troyanovskiy, to comment on the results of the discussion.

[Troyanovskiy] It must be said that, of course, the United Nations Organization is, in a sense, a reflection of the real world in which we live and in which various forces with both positive and negative charges are operating. Attempts are therefore being made to deflect, as it were, the United Nations from the positive course that was set for it by the authors of its Charter 40 years ago. Nonetheless, I think I shall in no way distort the truth if I say that the results of this session have been entirely favorable to the Soviet Union. First of all, one must note the important resolution that was adopted, and which envisages measures against the continuation of the arms race on earth and against extending it into space.

That resolution was adopted and supported by practically all the countries of the world, and it has to be noted that only one state, the United States, failed to support that resolution, which fully reflects, as it were, and corresponds to, the Soviet position in this sphere.

NATO SECRETARY GENERAL 'ADVERTISING' SDI

LD210950 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2015 GMT 20 Dec 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] We all favor peace. Who do you think this good phrase belongs to? To NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington. He uttered it at the Royal College of London. Unfortunately, he said nothing concrete about NATO's contribution to the cause of peace, nor could he do so as you yourselves understand. Yet listeners would have undoubtedly been interested in how ideas uttered at the Geneva negotiations are being implemented and in what the Lord himself thinks about the moratorium on banning nuclear explosions [as heard] declared by the Soviet side at the very beginning of August, and about the other Soviet peace initiatives. Instead of that, Carrington engaged in advertising the "star wars" program and expressed extreme regret that the Soviet approach to the Strategic Defense Initiative shows no attempt to smooth the sharp corners.

However, our country's position has been and remains immutable: We are against transferring the nuclear arms race into space. It is the United States, Britain, and the FRG who are preparing for "star wars" and who have increased the number of sharp corners.

PUGWASH MOVEMENT STATEMENT TO REAGAN REPORTED

LD232029 Moscow TASS in English 2009 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS -- Soviet scientists, members of the international Pugwash movement of scientists, have issued a statement addressed to the U.S. President and Administration and expressing their profound concern about the escalating nuclear arms race and the mortal danger threatening mankind.

An end to all nuclear weapons testing, they said, would be an important measure helping to ward off the nuclear threat which can only be removed by joint efforts.

The Soviet scientists are convinced that continued nuclear testing fuels the nuclear arms race, provides a source of growing international tension and increases the war threat. "This is why we urge the U.S. President and Administration to join the Soviet Union's moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which would positively develop the process started by the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva in terms of practical measures to halt the nuclear arms race," the statement said.

"The term of the announced Soviet moratorium expires on January 1, 1986. So there still is time, although it is fast running out. We hope that statesmanship and political realism will prevail over mistrust and an important step will be taken towards concluding a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear test ban," the statement said.

MISSING SOVIET SCIENTIST REPORTED IN CIA CONTROL

PM231535 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Krotov article: "The CIA's Fingerprints: On the 'Disappearance' of a Soviet Scientist"]

[Text] The other day the Soviet press published a statement by the USSR Academy of Sciences on the question of the "mysterious disappearance" in Spain of Soviet scientist Vladimir Aleksandrov, who was taking part in an international conference of municipalities which have proclaimed themselves to be nuclear-free zones. The statement pointed out that the USSR Embassy in Spain and the USSR Foreign Ministry have repeatedly made persistent requests to the Spanish authorities to take all necessary measures to find the Soviet citizen, but although some 9 months have elapsed, no clear answer has been received yet from the Spanish authorities to the question of where V.V. Aleksandrov is and what his fate has been.

So what did happen to V.V. Aleksandrov? As yet, only the following is reliably known.

On returning from Cordoba on the evening of 31 March 1985, V.V. Aleksandrov stopped at Madrid Havana Hotel. The following day he was to return to Moscow. However, when a Soviet Embassy staffer went to the hotel in the morning of 1 April to conduct V.V. Aleksandrov to the airport, he was not in the hotel. His personal belongings were found in the room he was staying in. A few days later V.V. Aleksandrov's documents were left at a Madrid police station by persons unknown...

What is this? A crime? An act of international terrorism? A "voluntary escape" to the West?

This last suggestion appeared simply absurd: V.V. Aleksandrov has been abroad many times and taken part in dozens of international meetings and conferences. In the previous 2 years alone he had been on official trips to Japan and the United States. And how could there be any question of an "escape," when several more trips abroad -- interesting trips from a scientific viewpoint -- lay ahead for V.V. Aleksandrov before the end of this year under the auspices of the USSR Academy of Sciences! And he knew about that.

The Soviet Embassy in Madrid continued to insist on a conscientious search for the lost Soviet scientist, but the Spanish authorities kept repeating: We have no information about V.V. Aleksandrov's whereabouts on Spanish territory.

In Moscow substantial additional efforts were also made to establish the truth about V.V. Aleksandrov's disappearance.

Weeks and even months passed. Suddenly, at the end of October, the U.S. WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper published an article by a certain Ralph de Toledano about nuclear physicist V.V. Aleksnadrov, who had supposedly "chosen freedom" and "defected voluntarily" to the West. The article said that Aleksandrov is not simply an important scientist, but a man with "hidden depths" and that, on Moscow's instructions, he was called upon to discredit the U.S. nuclear and space arms program. The U.S. journalist, citing authoritative sources, wrote that after his "voluntary escape" to the West V.V. Aleksandrov was sent to Washington, where, the author of the article claims, "intelligence experts and U.S. scientists are interrogating him" according to carefully developed methods.

This article might have gone unremarked -- the "free press" writes all kinds of rubbish, after all -- were it not for one fact. Ralph de Toledano was the first U.S. journalist -- citing the same sources, following the same pattern, and in practically the same terms -- to write about the "voluntary escape" to the West of Soviet diplomat V.S. Yurchenko. The whole world now knows what happened to Yurchenko next...But what has happened to the Soviet scientist? If Ralph de Toledano is to be believed, Aleksandrov's address is now known: CIA headquarters, Langley. And responsibility for the Soviet scientist's fate now rests with U.S. intelligence, whose leadership publicly declares its determination to "take all the necessary" measures to combat international terrorism, but in practice engages in it itself, keeping a kidnapped Soviet person under guard and inflicting on him and his psyche violence which has been well rehearsed on its many victime.

REAGAN STATEMENT CONFIRMS PRIORITY OF ARMS SPENDING

LD191230 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 19 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, December 19 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev reports:

The U.S. Administration continues to regard heavy arms spending as its first budget priority. This was confirmed by President Reagan in a statement at a special White House ceremony on the occasion of the signing by the President of a bill on balancing the federal budget.

The President said he continued to regard financing of military programs as his primary duty. He emphasized specifically his determination to go ahead with modernizing the U.S. nuclear potential. It is this program for further buildup of U.S. nuclear might as well as the "Strategic Defense Initiative" that are left untouched by cutbacks in federal spending to be made under the budget-balancing law.

As a matter of fact the administration hopes to leave intact other key military projects as well. A White House spokesman said that military spending is to increase in real terms at the rate of 3 per cent within the next few years. With inflation taken into account, this means that their growth rate will be 7-8 per cent a year.

Meantime it is known that the fast growth of military expenditures is the factor accounting for the enormous federal budget deficit which exceeded 211 billion dollars in the past fiscal year. While speaking of deficit reduction as his major duty of the American people, the President made it clear in his statement that the administration is going to discharge this duty chiefly by slashing spending on social programs, specifically those on which the lives of poor, sick and elderly people sometimes depend.

'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM VIEWS SUMMIT RESULTS

LD150431 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 14 Dec 85

["Top Priority" program on Geneva summit results moderated by Vladimir Posner with Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov from the United States of America and Canada Institute; on 13 December -- recorded]

[Text] Hello everyone, this is Vladimir Posner presenting "Top Priority." With me today [13 December] are our usual contributors, Dr Radomir Bogdanov, Dr Sergey Plekhanov, both of the Institute of USA and Canada Studies. Well, it's been a while since we have been together and in that while some very important things have happened; the most important of course being the meeting, the summit meeting in Geneva, between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

Obviously, that sets the theme for today's discussion, which is the results and what they mean. Now I'd like to remind you that at our last "Top Priority" meeting we discussed Geneva on the eve and we were somehat pessimistic. I was, I believe Dr Bogdanov also was, and Dr Plekhanov preferred not to say anything about it. Well, Geneva is now done with. What do you feel happened and what do you think the results mean? Who'd like to begin? Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Vladimir, let me begin with some preliminary remarks. Number one, I am very happy that we are back around this table again and let me flatter Vladimir a little bit, you as our moderator, because as usual you have taken a wise decision. You didn't invite us just the next day after Geneva. You have waited for some time and I understand why. Now today we have clearer picture and we may have some deeper thoughts on Geneva, on its meaning. So now I, my second point, is that really today after so many days and weeks after Geneva we may think on that in quite a usual environment and as I told you last time if I am wrong I would be ready to state it publicly. But I believe that I was half-wrong, not completely wrong and half-wrong you know, because I was not very much enthusiastic. I was little pessimistic and you know what is the most important thing, that at last it has happened. That is the real event. And now I believe that the meeting itself of the leaders of the two states was important by itself. It didn't achieve some concrete results we have expected. In that I am still pessimistic.

But what it did achieve is it cleared the atmosphere. And I believe that our -- we became more secure than before. We became more self-assured that we were on the right way. But that rather belongs to the notion of fate, which is something very, not objective, which is something you cannot touch, you cannot, you just cannot feel it, but I believe that the most important thing now, just to keep spirit of Geneva alive, because on that ground you can build up real things, just to develop, to work on spirit of Geneva. Don't you agree with me Sergey? That now that is the most important thing?

[Plekhanov] That is right. I think Geneva is important first because it drew a line under certain developments, and secondly because it set the stage for a new process in Soviet-American relations. As the drawing a line and kind of updating, to just drawing the line, it is important that the two leaders recognize, number one the need to improve Soviet-American relations, to seek common ground actively wherever that is possible, given all the serious differences that exist between the two countries, this is the only way to go, by reducing distrust, increasing mutual understanding, and finding common ground on as many issues as possible. Secondly, it was important that the problems of security, of war and peace, the arms race and arms control, were the central issue in Geneva. And this reflects the objective situation between the two countries.

Really, no other issue is more important than the issue of security. There were several important doctrinal points agreed upon and included in the joint statement by Secretary General Gorbachev and President Reagan: Number one, it's the statement that nuclear war can never be won, must never be fought. And it's good that this statement has been made on the top level and reflects a consensus on both sides, and we are more than happy to see that confirmed by the Reagan Administration, which in the past used to express a different attitude toward nuclear war.

Then, I think it's important that the two leaders stressed that everything must be done in order to prevent any sort of armed clashes between the two sides, and kind of war, nuclear or conventional, and some specific measures were proposed to that effect. The two sides have agreed to speed up the process of arms control talks. They have directed their delegations at Geneva, at the Geneva talks which have been going on since January, to speed up that process.

They have compared the positions of the two sides on limiting offensive nuclear, on reducing offensive nuclear weapons, and they have come to the conclusion that there are points of convergence there and that work can be, can proceed toward working out an agreement.

[Posner] Let me, let me interrupt there for just 1 minute. As I see what you two gentlemen are saying, Dr Bogdanov is speaking about an intangible but very important spirit that has been created by the meeting in Geneva. You are talking more about the concrete agreements that were reached that are of importance in concrete areas, which is a slightly different thing, but also certainly positive. What I would like you both now to share your views on is: What now, where do we go? Please.

[Bogdanov] Yes, I'm sorry Vladimir. I agree with Sergey that of course we, we've got a couple of concrete things in the joint statement, but my problem is if the American side is really ready -- I would put it like that, is really ready, to carry on those concrete things agreed upon in the statement -- and my difficulty is that I am not sure that American side, and when I say American side I mean the American political establishment, political mechanism; are they ready to carry on that policy into practical steps? That is my difficulty and my worry. And to be frank with you, since you put that very important question, is that they are not yet ready. Let me put it like that, that any, any, any president, any, any American President, even as powerful as Reagan is and as President Reagan is popular, he needs a consensus but my problem is are they building up this consensus or not around Geneva policy. By the way, I believe that we are entitled to use now and in the future that term "Geneva policy". Now my question is, how long it will last or will it survive, you know.

[Posner interrupting] Yes.

[Bogdanov continuing] That's my problem.

[Posner] On August 6, if you recall, the Soviet Government took what I consider to be and what most people would agree here is a very important initiative. It unilaterally announced the stop of all nuclear tests. This was in a way a signal, how we were looking forward to Geneva, the kinds of things we were ready to do. And if you recall, the Soviet Government said that it would unilaterally stop all nuclear tests until the 1st of January 1986. Now that is not far away. And I am thinking in the terms of what Dr Bogdanov said, if there is some kind of gesture that the United States might make to signal that indeed the spirit of Geneva or the Geneva policy is something that will continue, I would see it as taking up the Soviet example. Now what do you think about that and about what Dr Bogdanov said, and about the future?

[Plekhanov] Well I agree very much that joining the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests would be a very specific and not really any ground-shaking step that the United States Government could take, without jeopardizing its security posture or anything, but it could take that step in order to show that it is serious about those things which it signed in the joint statement in Geneva. I agree with Dr Bogdanov that the problem now is to put those words into deeds. You see, before Geneva, in the months leading up to Geneva, the U.S. Government took quite a few steps which really looked like an attempt if not to derail the process leading up to the summit, then to minimize the specific results that could be achieved at the, at the Geneva summit conference, and refusal to join the moratorium and in fact challenging the moratorium by resuming the program of nuclear testing, was one of those very unpleasant and unconstructive things that were done by the U.S. side before Geneva. And in fact we now know for a fact that there are people in the administration, in the Reagan Administration, who are very unhappy about the fact that Geneva ever took place.

[Posner interrupting]..Very interesting point.

[Plekhanov continuing] And they now are, they are still in the administration, they are now working full time in order to dissipate the spirit of Geneva in order to kill the process, or at least to make it as empty as possible.

[Posner] I'd like to take up on that little point, but a very important point you make concerning people in the American establishment, high-up government level, who are basically, who were, are, and probably will be, basically against the spirit of Geneva. Now do you think that they will prove to be a very serious kind of stumble-block?

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, it's not my difficulty, people in the administration, I believe that Reagan himself, being very powerful President, if he likes it he can control them. That, that is not my difficulty. My difficulty is with his political base, with his supporters outside the administration, within the Republican Party, within the Congressional Republican caucus, and things like that, you know. As usual, what happens, by one hand they talk to us, by the other hand they are so (?shy) with their own people that they demonstrate to them: No, we are not benign to Russians, we are very harsh to them, and they are going to demonstrate that by what -- by resuming our tests. So, as a student of American politics for the last 25 years, to be frank with you, I am not surprised. But that is usual, the so-called balance in between different forces within the political establishment. What worries me, what Sergey put it already, and you said it already, that in that game you may always over-play, over-play to such an extent that you will kill small, very modest positive results of Geneva, just to please the other domestic political interests.

[Posner] With time running out, I'd like to ask you Dr Plekhanov with your view on this what the future may hold for us, and whether or not you have an equally, shall we say, bleak view of what may happen? How do you feel?

[Plekhanov] Well I think that the struggles around U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union are far from over. They were brought to the fore in connection with the Geneva summit and I think the publication of the letter by Secretary Weinberger on the eve of Geneva which was interpreted by one of the people on the President's team as an attempt to sabotage the summit.

That's pretty harsh language, and the fact of the publication shows that there are differences, and there are conflicts within the administration,even if the administration doesn't, prefers not to recognize it. And I think the conflict is quite obvious to everybody who wants to see, because the administration is trying to ride two horses at the same time. Number one, it wants to continue its traditional policy of trying to acquire military superiority over the Soviet Union,to pressure the Soviet Union, to sort of try to build an anti-Soviet coalition on a global scale, and so on, to deny the Soviet Union the equal right to exist as a political power of major, a major political power. On the otherhand, it has been forced to recognizethat you can't really deal with the Soviet Union on such a basis.

So, these two processes are very difficult to combine. One has to choose. If the administration follows in the direction laid out in Geneva, then I think that we will not only improve Soviet-American relations, but also provide for a success of the Reagan administration's foreign policy. At the same time I don't think that the road of further arms race, increased confrontation, is a road to success for the U.S. Government. Really I think Geneva clearly made that very clear, and I think this is what the world expects of the U.S. Government, to follow in the spirit of Geneva down the road of specific achievement.

[Posner] That's quite ture, I think the world does expect that, I think we all hope for that, but I don't believe that it is possible without solving the problem "star wars." Now you've certainly noticed that I did not bring up that issue today. And the reason I didn't is because it demands an in-depth appraisal, it demands probably an entire issue of "Top Priority." Indeed, it is a top priority subject. Without solving star wars there is not going to be any kind of true development of what people are calling the spirit of Geneva. Without making it absolutely guaranteed that space will not be militarized, there can be no real progress. I think that is something that should be said with the utmost clarity, absolutely unequivocally. That is the major problem to the improvement of relations, and it is the key to disarmament. Let us make that clear to one and all. And having said that, let me say goodbye to all the listeners of "Top Priority" until we meet again.

'SERIOUS OBSTACLES' EXIST IN JOINT TU CONTACTS

LD182107 Moscow TASS in English 2014 GMT 18 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 18 TASS -- The results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva have become an effective stimulus to invigoration of the international activities of Soviet trade unions. Together with the organizations of fraternal socialist countries they will look for new forms and directions of cooperation with the trade unions of countries of various political orientation in the cause of removing the threat of a new world war, of preventing a nuclear catastrophe and of ensuring the right of all peoples to live in peace, Stepan Shalayev, chairman of All-Union Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions (AUCCTU), stated at the AUCCTU plenary meeting today.

Touching upon Soviet-U.S. trade union contacts, the AUCCTU leader stated: "We are strong supporters of their improvement. They serve the interests of the working people of the two countries. We know that many big trade unions of the USA likewise come out in favour of the development of these contacts".

Stepan Shalayev pointed out that there are quite a number of serious obstacles to the development of contacts between Soviet and U.S. trade unions. One of them is first of all the rabid anti-communism of the leaders of the U.S. trade union association AFL-CIO as well as the unfounded denials of visas to representatives of Soviet working people and trade unions by the U.S. Department of State. Meanwhile, the trade unions, as the largest public organizations, are called upon to make a substantial contribution to the cause of mutual understanding between the Soviet and U.S. peoples.

The attention of the U.S. President to these facts was drawn in the AUCCTU's open letter sent on the eve of the Geneva meeting, he said.

Stepan Shalayev said that Soviet sectoral trade unions, which have already had experience in maintaining contacts with the identical trade unions of the United States, will in every way strive for the development and broadening of the dialogue.

All trade union contacts, at whatever level, will be subordinated to the lofty goals of building confidence and better mutual understanding between the working people of various countries for the incoming year 1986, which has been declared an international year of peace by the United Nations Organization, to become decisive in the struggle for peace, security and cooperation, Stepan Shalayev pointed out.

REPORTAGE ON LI PENG E.EUROPE, USSR VISITS

Visits CSSR, Bulgaria

PM231045 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS reports under the general heading "Visits and Conversations"]

[Text] Prague, 20 Dec -- CSSR President G. Husak has received here Vice Premier of the PRC State Council Li Peng, who was on an official visit to Czechoslovakia.

During their conversation, CTK reports, the sides stressed that averting the danger of nuclear catastrophe, achieving progress in efforts to halt the arms race on earth, preventing it in outer space, and returning to a policy of detente and friendly relations among the peoples are the main tasks of the present day.

Sofia, 20 Dec -- Chairman of the Bulgarian State Council T. Zhivkov has received Vice Premier of the PRC State Council Li Peng, who is on an official visit here.

As reported by BTA, the state of and prospects for Bulgarian-Chinese cooperation in the spheres of economics, trade, science, and technology were discussed during their conversation. The desire of both sides to expand bilateral ties on a mutually beneficial basis was stressed.

Stopover in Moscow

OW231606 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Li Peng, member of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee, member of the Secretariat of the CPC Central Committee, and Vice Premier of the State Council, made a short stopover in Moscow en route for home on 22 December. At the airport, the distinguished Chinese guest was met by Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Kapitsa, deputy Soviet foreign minister; and other officials; and also by Li Zewang, Chinese ambassador to the USSR.

Meets Gorbachev

LD231657 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow December 23 TASS -- On December 23, Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Li Peng, member of the Political Bureau and Secretariat of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, vice premier of the PRC State Council, who is currently on a short visit in Moscow. Views were exchanged on some issues of Soviet-Chinese relations and other problems of mutual interest.

Mikhail Gorbachev has reaffirmed the Soviet side's sincere striving for a serious improvement of relations with the People's Republic of China. Further progress in strengthening goodneighborliness and cooperation between our two socialist countries would accord with the long-term, vital interests of the Soviet and Chinese peoples, the interests of peace and security in Asia and all over the world. Li Peng has declared the wish of the Chinese side to contribute to the process of normalising bilateral relations, pointed out that the PRC is interested in maintaining international peace.

Meets Talyzin, Departs

LD232017 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Excerpts] Mikhail Sergeyevhich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today received Li Peng, member of the Politburo and Secretariat of the CPC Central Committee, vice premier of the PRC State Council, who is in Moscow on a brief visit.

Also today, a meeting took place between Comrade Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Minister Ministers and chairman of USSR Gosplan, and Li Peng.

The conversation, which was conducted in a businesslike manner, discussed certain questions of relations between the Soviet Union and the PRC, including that of the [word indistinct] of the session of the Soviet-Chinese (?Commission) on Economic, Trade, and Scientific-Technical Cooperation.

On the same day Li Peng left Moscow. He was seen off at the airport by Comrade Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Kapitsa, USSR Deputy foreign minister, and other officials, as well as Li Zewang, the PRC ambassador in the Soviet Union.

HIJACKED SOVIET PASSENGER PLANE LANDS IN PRC

HK241018 Hong Kong AFP in English 1014 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] Beijing, Dec 24 (AFP) -- A hijacked Soviet passenger aircraft carrying 50 people made a forced landing in a northeastern Chinese border city three days ago, a well-informed Chinese source said here today. The aircraft made a forced landing in Hailaer, a rail junction and customs clearing point about 150 kilometres (100 miles) south west of the Soviet border in China's Heilongjiang Province, the source said.

The Chinese source was unable to identify the make of the plane or say where it had been headed at the time of the hijack. The source could not provide any information about the hijackers or what had happened to them.

Chinese officials sent to deal with the case had recently returned after three days and three nights without sleep during which tjime they apparently arranged for the plane to return to the Soviet Union, the source said. It was not known whether the plane had already returned. A spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry said he was "not very clear" about the situation.

The person who answered the phone at the Soviet Embassy asked the caller to wait and then replied "we have no information." The source said China appeared to be keeping the hijack a secret to avoid causing the Soviet Union a loss of face at a time when relations between the communist giants are gradually warming.

TALYZIN MEETS DPRK FOREIGN TRADE OFFICIAL

PM231243 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] On 20 December N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, had a meeting with Kim Pok-sin, candidate member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo, vice premier of the DPRK Administration Council, and chairman of the DPRK foreign trade committee.

In the course of the talk, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, questions of the further development of trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and the DPRK were discussed. Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador to the USSR, took part in the talks.

DPRK VICE PRESIDENT MAKES MOSCOW STOPOVER

PM231237 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Stopover in Moscow"]

[Text] Yim Chu'un-ch'u, member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo and vice president of the DPRK, stopped over in Moscow 21 December en route from Berlin to Pyongyang. He was greeted and seen off at the airport by T.Kh. Koshoyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; other officials; and Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador to the USSR.

LIGHT INDUSTRY MINISTER MEETS WITH DPRK PREMIER

PM231432 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Cooperation"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 21 Dec -- Kang Song-san, premier of the DPRK Administrative Council, received V.G. Klyuyev, USSR minister of light industry, who is here, 20 December. A talk was held in which questions of the further development of cooperation between the two countries in the sphere of the production of consumer goods were touched upon.

REPORTAGE ON KANG SONG-SAN MOSCOW VISIT

Visit Previewed

LD240343 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0304 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] At the invitation of the Soviet Government Kang Song-san, member of the Central Committee Political Bureau of the Workers' Party of Korea, premier of the DPRK State Administrative Council, arrives today in Moscow on an official, friendly visit. Soviet people cordially welcome the arrival in our country of Comrade Kang Song-san, and express the assurance that this visit will facilitate the further strengthening of friendship and unity [splochennost] between the USSR and the DPRK, and the closer interaction between our countries in the struggle for lasting peace and security in Asia and throughout the whole world.

Ryzhkov, Aliyev at Arrival

LD241049 Moscow TASS in English 1034 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 24 TASS -- Kang Song-san, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea and premier of the Administrative Council of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, arrived here today for an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

He was met at the airport by Nilolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Geydar Aliyev, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and other officials.

SOVIET-JAPANESE FISHING COMMISSION MEETS

LD232236 Moscow TASS in English 2214 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS -- The second session of the Soviet-Japanese fisheries commission set up under an intergovernmental agreement last December has opened in Moscow today to discuss questions of fishing operations in 200-mile zones of the two countries.

"Our long term agreements contribute to stable cooperation, said Valdimir Grigoryev", head of the Soviet delegation and director of the industrial fishing board of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Fisheries. "At the same time it should be noted that conditions for fisheries need to be improved. Fishing operations of Soviet vessels in the Japanese zone are little effective. Japanese fishermen continue to infringe fishing regulations in the 200-mile Soviet zone".

"We hope that the session will objectively assess the results of our yearly work to provide conditions for fishing operations on an equal basis in future", Vladimir Grigoryev went on to say.

"The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the session. The Soviet fishing industry faces the tasks of improving the supply of fish products to the people, of a fuller use of the Soviet 200-mile zone's resources as well as of raising the efficiency of work of Soviet fishermen in the course of fishing operations in foreign zones. A useful exchange of opinion took place when Soviet Minister of Fisheries Vladimir Kamentsev met Japan's Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Mr Sato this year. The meeting gave a new impetus to the development of Soviet-Japanese cooperation in fishing.

I think that this ministerial meeting had created a precondition for the successful work of our commission's second session", Vladimir Grigoryev said.

SHEVARDNADZE RECEIVES INDIAN AMBASSADOR

LD201606 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, received Nurul Hasan, ambassador of the Republic of India to the USSR today.

During their conversation, which took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere, the Indian ambassador's attention was drawn to the package of constructive and realistic measures put forward by the Soviet Union with the aim of saving mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe. The two sides expressed concern at the continuing tension in several areas of Asia.

The high level and dynamism of the development of Soviet-Indian friendly relations was noted.

INDIAN MINISTER TO FINALIZE TRADE ACCORD

BK211605 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1530 GMT 21 Dec 85

[Text] The commerce minister, Mr Arjun Singh, arrived in Moscow today to finalize the Indo-Soviet trade agreement for 1986-90. The agreement is expected to be signed on Monday [23 December].

DRA CALLS FOR 'DIALOGUE' TO END BLOODSHED

PM221349 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 December 1985 First Edition p 5

[Text] The Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan recently called on its compatriots to start a broad dialogue. The appeal clearly formulates the Afghan leadership's approach to the solution of what is probably the key task of the current stage in the revolution -- ending bloodshed, normalizing the situation all over the country's territory.

Far from all people in Afghanistan, even among working sections of the population, accepted the April Revolution, the policy of people's power directed at eradicating poverty, hunger, and rightlessness, at creating a new, prosperous and truly democratic society. This is not surprising for a backward, semi-feudal country with deep-rooted religious traditions and nearly total illiteracy.

A considerable number of people fell for mendacious counterrevolutionary propaganda. Errors of the first stage of the revolution -- passion for revolutionary phrases, enforcement of social reforms without due account for the real situation, social and national specifics of the country -- had a negative effect too.

Time is needed to remove the accumulated prejudices, and to dispel illusions. It is necessary to create an atmosphere of positive dialogue between public and political forces, including those who so far stick to positions hostile to the revolution, in the name of national revival of Afghanistan.

It is, naturally, not easy to overcome the differences. Reconciliation presupposes known compromises. The People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan proceeds from this premise in its desire to expand the social base of the revolution. The Revolutionary Council's declaration points to the readiness to admit representatives of various strata and groups into the leading bodies of state authority.

This approach provides for strengthening traditions of self-government through councils of elders or jirgas, active participation of national capital, private businessmen in the solution of economic and political tasks. This is not a manifestation of weakness. This is rather manifestation of confidence of people's power of its strength, of the rightness of the revolutionary cause.

The top-priority task, Babrak Karmal stressed at the recent plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, "is to expand influence on the masses, to acquire new friends and political allies. It is only in this way that we will be able to isolate, and eventually destroy counter-revolutionary forces." Advancement has become apparent lately in all spheres of life in Afghanistan. Industrial production has exceeded pre-revolutionary levels. The ranks of the PDPA, youth and other mass public organizations swelled, became stronger. Elections to local government bodies -- councils, are being held successfully. The polling already closed in the capital, the provinces of Kabul, Nangarhar and some others. Social, democratic changes are being carried out despite fierce resistance from internal and external counterrevolution.

The declaration of Afghanistan's Revolutionary Council evoked a positive response in various sections and groups of the Afghan population, including the clergy, tribes and national bourgeoisie. Their representatives express their readiness to facilitate the process of normalizing the situation, ensuring peace and security in the country.

The new trends in Afghanistan's socio-political life, it would seem, ought to be welcomed in neighbouring countries -- Iran and Pakistan, whose rulers repeat time and again that they, allegedly, "wish peace" to the Afghan people. It is apparent, however, that Afghanistan's political document caused confusion and perplexity within the ruling circles of these countries. There is no other explanation for their ban even on mentioning the declaration of the Reovolutionary Council. Tehran responded by mounting a slanderous campaign against Democratic Afghanistan, Islamabad by heightening tension on the Afghan-Pakistani border.

The Pakistani Army has started "appeasing" Pushtun tribes living in the border areas, who demanded that anti-Afghan subversive bases situated on their territory be removed, and tried to hinder the movement of gangs of bandits and weapons into neighbouring Afghanistan. To suppress the tribes, the regime sent in tanks, armoured carriers and artillery. The attempts to justify these actions by some "internal" reasons are false through and through. They cannot be assessed as anything but openly anti-Afghan, and aggressive. What is the real worth of the Pakistani leaders' assurances of their allegedly 'sincere' desire for a political settlement of the Afghan problem? What "peaceful settlement" do they talk about while brutally suppressing those who blocked the way to the gangs of mercenaries sent into Afghanistan from Pakistan?

It is indicative that they in Washington and other Western capitals, while constantly clamouring about alleged "violations' of human rights in Afghanistan, failed to find a single word of condemnation for the Pakistani regime's bloody actions against its own people. Can it be that Islamabad, in undertaking the punitive operation against the Pushtuns, enlisted support from its overseas patron, the chief architect of anti-Afghan aggression? As to the policy of Democratic Afghanistan, its aims are absolutely clear. These are the striving for peace for itself and its neighbours, the desire to build normal, goodneighbourly relations with them on the basis of mutual respect, non-interference in the internal affairs of one another. This is the upholding of the legitimate right of the Afghan people to handle their problems by themsevles, without outside interference.

SOKOLOV GREETS SRV COUNTERPART ON ARMY JUBILEE

PM231856 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Dec 85 Second Edition p 1

[Text] To Army General Comrade Van Tien Dung, SRV Minister of National Defense

Esteemed Comrade Minister! On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own account I cordially congratulate you and all Vietnamese servicemen on the 41st anniversary of the Vietnamese People's Army. Soviet servicemen and all Soviet people, loyal to the Leninist banner of socialist internationalism, will continue to tirelessly strengthen the traditional friendship between our peoples and armed forces and to resolutely support the fraternal Vietnamese people in their efforts to uphold their independence and to strengthen socialism and ensure peace in Southeast Asia. I express the wish that you and all Vietnamese People's Army personnel will welcome the Sixth Communist Party of Vietnam Congress with new successes in the improvement of military skills for the sake of strengthening your socialist motherland's defense capability.

With communist greetings,

Marshal of the Soviet Union, S. Sokolov, USSR Defense Minister

PRAVDA CARRIES LAO LEADERS' MESSAGE TO USSR

PM231459 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 85 First Edition p 1

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers

Dear comrades! On behalf of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] Central Committee, the Supreme People's Assembly and Council of Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR], and all the Lao people, we express thanks and profound gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers, and all the Soviet people for their sincere congratulations and best wishes on the 10th anniversary of the proclamation of the LPDR. We feel great satisfaction with your high assessment of the Lao people's successes, achieved in the cause of building a new life and the foundations of socialism and the defense of revolutionary gains. We are firmly confident that the relations of fraternal, indissoluble friendship and all-around cooperation between our parties and states, built on the firm basis of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, will be further developed and will flourish in the interests of Laos and the Soviet Union and of the cause of peace and international security. Allow us to take this opportunity once again to express thanks and profound gratitude for the support and invaluable assistance granted by the CPSU, the Soviet Government, and the fraternal Soviet people to the cause of the Lao revolution. We wish you and the fraternal Soviet people new, still greater successes in fulfilling the decisions of the 26th party congress and the 11th 5-Year Plan targets and greeting the 27th CPSU Congress in a fitting manner. May the relations of fraternal friendship, combat solidarity, and all-around cooperation between the parties, states, and peoples of Laos and the Soviet Union strengthen!

Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee; Souphanouvong, president and chairman of the Supreme People's Assembly of the LPDR.

ROMANIAN FOREIGN MINISTER PAYS OFFICIAL VISIT

Met by Shevardnadze

LD231541 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS -- Member of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, foreign minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania Ilie Vaduva has arrived in Moscow today at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

At the airport he was met by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, other officials.

Begins Talks With Shevardnadze

LD231726 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS -- Soviet-Romanian talks have opened in Moscow today. They are conducted by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, and Ilie Vaduva, member of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, foreign minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

Ilie Vaduva has arrived on an official friendly visit in the Soviet capital today at the invitation of the USSR Government.

Talks Continue

LD241236 Moscow TASS in English 1227 GMT 24 Dec 85

["In a Friendly Atmosphere" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 24 TASS -- Talks were continued today between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and Ilie Vaduva, member of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (PCR), Romanian minister of foreign affairs.

A set of matters of Soviet-Romanian relations were discussed during the talks in the spirit of the accords reached at the meetings between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Nicolae Ceaucescu, PCR general secretary, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

International problems of mutual interest were considered as well. A great importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which, as was pointed out by the top leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member states in Prague in November 1985, creates favourable opportunities for an improvement of the general atmosphere in the world and for a return to detente, was emphasized.

The sides expressed determination to follow the line in international affairs, which was agreed upon at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states in Sofia, to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the countries of the socialist community, and to raise the effectiveness of their cooperation in the international arena.

Relations Viewed

LD231059 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] By invitation of the Soviet Government, Comrade Ilie Vaduva, minister of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Romania, member of the RCP Political Executive Committee, arrives in our country for an official friendly visit today.

The Soviet Union and Romania are linked by historic ties of friendship. The Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance Treaty signed in 1948 between our two countries laid the foundation for fraternal cooperation between the peoples and governments of the USSR and the Socialist Republic of Romania. The new Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance Treaty of 7 July 1970, and the joint Soviet-Romanian Statement adopted on 24 November 1976 were clear landmarks on the path of development of bilateral relations. These became a reliable basis for further deepening expanding Soviet-Romanian ties in many spheres.

In the years which have elapsed since the end of World War II, Romanian working people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, have turned their country from a backward agrarian country into a socialist state with a ramified and developing economy. Its many years of economic cooperation within the CEMA, and military-political cooperation in the Warsaw Pact have played a great role in Romania's successes.

Today, the Romanian people, implementing the decisions of the 13th Communist Party Congress, are rightly proud of their successes. Soviet people rejoice in these successes and highly appraise the relations of friendship existing between our countries, parties and peoples. True to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, the Soviet Union conducts a policy of strengthening relations of alliance with Romania, expanding interaction in the political, economic, cultural and other spheres, and of developing all-round cooperation within the Warsaw Pact and the CEMA. This corresponds to the vital interests of our countries and serves the cause of strengthening the unity and cohesion of the socialist community.

SOKOLOV GREETS SFRY'S MAMULA ON ARMY JUBILEE

PM231900 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Dec 85 Second Edition p 1

[Text] To Admiral of the Fleet Comrade B. Mamula, SFRY federal secretary for National Defense

Esteemed Comrade Secretary!

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own account I send cordial congratulations to you and to all Yugoslav servicemen on the occasion of the 44th anniversary of the Yugoslav People's Army.

I wish Yugoslav People's Army personnel new successes in the improvement of military skills for the sake of further strengthening the SFRY's defense capability.

I express confidence that the relations of friendship and cooperation between our peoples and armies will continue to develop successfully for the sake of peace and socialism.

With communist greetings.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov, USSR defense minister

STATEMENT GIVEN TO UK CONDEMNING SDI PARTICIPATION

LD231853 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] At the USSR Foreign Ministry today the British ambassador to Moscow was given a statement in connection with the memorandum signed between Great Britain and the United States in December of this year on British participation in the American Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, which is intended to create a large-scale system of antimissile defense with parts based in space, despite the provisions of the Soviet-American Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty signed in 1972.

As is known, this is a matter not of defense but of increasing offensive capacity, of attempts to gain military supremacy. The inclusion of Great Britain in the SDI, the statement says, contradicts the affirmations by the British government about its attachment to the aims of preventing the arms race in space and ending it on earth, confirmed at the highest level in Geneva. The importance of the resolution of this great task was stressed, and the hope was expressed that the British leadership will confirm with practical actions its statements in favour of limiting the arms race and strengthening strategic atability.

PRAVDA CALLS FRG BACKING OF SDI 'FATAL STEP'

PM231145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[V. Mikhaylov article: "Bonn's Fatal Step"]

[Text] Strange and, at first sight, paradoxical events are taking place in Bonn at present. The country contains no significant political forces which have not welcomed the results of the recent Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva or failed to note the importance of the beginning of the normalization of the situation in the world begun by the summit and the need for all countries to promote that process. However, Bonn has taken a step leading in the completely opposite direction: On 18 December the FRG Government decided to start talks with the United States on the terms of participation in the American "star wars" program. The reason why the meeting in Geneva failed to reach agreement on a radical limitation of weapons of mass destruction is well known. There, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, "the following fact loomed largest: The 'strategic defense initiative' propagandized by the U.S. president is the main obstacle preventing a 50-percent cut" in the two powers' arsenals.

It is clear that those who really seek to end the arms race should at least now, after Geneva, not undertake anything that would bolster in Washington the dangerous and illusory belief that space weapons are omnipotent. And one would expect more from the FRG'S political leadership. After all, it is well known what the blind obsession with "miracle weapons" which flourished in Germany itself in the not so distant past led to. It is also well known that "ensuring greater security by a smaller number of weapons" has been proclaimed by the present ruling coalition to be the basic aim of FRG policy. True, belief in the commitment to this "basic aim" was shaken already at the end of 1983 when new American Pershings appeared on FRG territory. But at that time government representatives in Bonn shrugged: The NATO nuclear missile decision had been made by their predecessors and we, they said, have no right to break it, on the contrary, we are obliged to display "Atlantic solidarity." They closed their eyes to the rage of protest in the country, although it was clear even to someone who was blind that the appearance of new Pershings had sharply increased the number of nuclear weapons and reduced FRG security.

However what has now been decided in Bonn, namely to confirm "political support" on the FRG Government's part for the American "star wars" program and to reach agreement with the United States on "improving the basis in private law" for the participation of West German firms and scientific research centers in the program, is bereft of even that false excuse. There is no NATO decision or agreement by the previous government. On the contrary, there is a statement by the federal chancellor already after the Soviet-American summit about an intention "...to take joint care to ensure that the results of the Geneva meeting lead to specific accords and the consolidation of peace in Europe and throughout the world."

About the plans to militarize outer space you can say whatever you like, save that they are designed to ensure greater security with fewer weapons. On the contrary, the people in Bonn who are campaigning for participation in SDI are in fact advocating a new and even more dangerous round in the arms race. The Pentagon program, going under the euphonious name of the "Strategic Defense Ihitiative," will launch the arms race into the boundless expanses of the universe. And that dangerous plan is proclaimed in Bonn as a program which is "justified and politically necessary and on the whole in accord with the West's security interests."

West German statesmen know that if Washington were to abandon its plans to militarize outer space it would be possible right now to halve the respective nuclear arms of the United States and the USSR. And that just as a start leading to the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction and a crucial limitation of outer weapons. However, the Bonn Government's statements have hitherto found no room to support this life-enhancing alternative. On the contrary, they are hastening to help prop up the main obstacle to peace involving fewer weapons.

The incompatibility of such actions with the calls "to take care" to develop the principles laid down at the Geneva meeting is glaringly obvious. But the matter does not stop there. The FRG's involvement in the American "star wars" program could spur the United States to infringe the crucial limitation of armaments constituted by the unlimited Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems. Moreover, Bonn would itself be guilty of its direct violation, since the ABM Treaty forbids the United States and the Soviet Union to share technology in that sphere with other countries. The FRG Government, however, intends to sign an agreement with Washington on the exchange of the results of research work precisely in the ABM sphere. So what we have here is verbal advocacy in favor of maintaining the ABM Treaty intact while in fact it is being undermined.

Since the fifties, when the talk was about whether or not to give the West German Army access to atomic weapons, there has been no discussion more fundamentally important for the country, and indeed for the world, than the present discussion about whether to jon in the American "star wars" program or not. Then the past was too close and the memories too painful. The FRG Government had at that time to renounce weapons of mass destruction and solemnly declared that it would not attempt to obtain them. In the future either. In exchange for this promise the Western powers began to remove one after another the postwar restrictions and in 1984 the last prohibition, a prohibition on producing heavy kinds of weapons, was lifted. And now those circles in the FRG for whom the state's full and equal legal status is defined by the right of unrestricted participation in the arms race would clearly like to exact revenge and carry out what they failed to do in the fifties.

It is now a question of preparing to break through, bypassing the nuclear phase, into the new generation of strategic weapons -- space-based ones. The organization of the breakthrough is proceeding under a government headed by the same conservative grouping of the Christian Democratic Union and the Christian Social Union as in the time of the debates surrounding the provision of atomic weapons for the Bundeswehr. And a leader of it is that same chief of the extreme right-wing forces -- F.J. Strauss. The only thing is, then he could not yet rely on the now swiftly growing military-industrial complex in the south of the FRG, which is a kind of West German California, and which has elbowed out the traditional weapons foundry of the Ruhr.

The dual aim of the bellicose right-wing conservative circles on both sides of the Atlantic is becoming increasingly evident. On the one hand, to embroil the FRG in the strategic arms race and thereby hitch it more firmly to the Pentagon chariot. On the other, to give the "star wars" program a semblance of "international" approval. J. Abrahamson, leader of the organization for implementing SDI, has frankly acknowledged that the involvement of West European countries and Japan "will, in our opinion, lead to deeper understanding of the program...and that understanding is a vitally important foundation for a future decision about switching to the development [razrabotki] stage." Relying on the present assertions by Bonn officialdom that FRG participation will be limited "just to research," and that, moreover, just in order to acquire influence over the United States and prevent the militarization of outer space is thus tantamount to believing the tail can wag the dog. In reality the involvement of allies in the Pentagon's armament plans is regarded by the latter as an important support for pushing forward the "star wars" program.

The present situation in the world is such that in no single country, including the chief Western power, is domestic reaction capable on its own of overcoming the antiwar movement. That is why the American "hawks" are hurrying to enlist the support of like-minded people on both the other side of the Atlantic and the Pacific in the hope of overturning everything engendered in Geneva and taking the arms race into space.

The main means for achieving these plans are lies and exploitation of people's desire for security. The champions of SDI are laying it on thick to impart plausibility to the transatlantic fabrications that the USSR is "already there" in outer space and that "dangerous instability will arise" in the world if the United States "does not respond." In the RG an anti-Soviet campaign has been launched along many, one would have thought, forgotten avenues to cover up its retreat from the proclaimed course of "greater security with fewer weapons."

The Washington practice of pushing through new militarist programs by claiming that they promote accords on ending the arms race is also being employed. But in reality things are quite the reverse. The arguement about the "benefit" of SDI "in the sphere of civil application" is also devoid of logic. "That kind of hope is unjustified and unrealistic," THE WALL STREET JOURNAL writes. "The technical innovations for civil industry developed directly in its sectors will be 10 times cheaper than the same innovations as 'spin offs' from military developments," the conservative FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE observes. Even FRG President Von Weizsaecker warns the country against "regarding the American space plans as a technological challenge which Europe must accept." The future, including the FRG's future, does not lie in the technology of destruction or the pursuit of illusory "miracle-weapons." The country has behind it many years of experience of international detente, which has shown the broadest strata of the West German population the indisputable advantages of peaceful cooperation.

It is to be hoped that the FRG has not yet had its final say. The choice of a path -- the militarization of near-earth space and the attendant careering out of control of the arms race, or the prevention of this, the halting of the arms race on earth, and the restoration of peaceful international cooperation -- will determine the destiny of civilization. Responsible politicians, particularly state leaders, must adopt a firm, constructive stance in favor of peace.

CPSU CC GREETS ALGERIAN SPECIAL CONGRESS

LD231956 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS -- The CPSU and all Soviet people identify with the Algerian people which consistently stands for implementing the revolutionary principles of the national charter and protecting them from imperialist and reactionary scheming, says a telegram of greetings sent by the CPSU Central Committee to the special congress of the national liberation.

In the Soviet Union there is an invariable appreciation of the anti-imperialist policy maintained by Algeria and its contribution to the struggle by Arab and African nations countering the neo-colonialist policies of imperialism and its allies. Experience shows that the success of this struggle largely depends on the cohesion of progressive, patriotic forces and their vigorous joint action.

The Soviet Union and Algeria, the Soviet and Algerian peoples are united by the bonds of a friendship of many years and of equitable cooperation, which meets our mutual interests. The CPSU will continue consistently following a policy of strengthening close friendly relations with Algeria and developing ties with the National Liberation Front party, the telegram of greetings said.

LOMEYKO DENIES AGREEMENT ON ARMS TO IRAN, IRAQ

LD231137 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 1032 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Excerpts] Kuwait, 23 Dec (KUNA) -- Vladimir Lomeyko director of the press section of the Soviet Foreign Ministry and its official spokesman, denied in an interview published here today that the United States and the Soviet Union had agreed at the Geneva summit not to supply Iran and Iraq with arms as part of the two countries efforts to stop the Iraqi-Iranian war.

In an interview with AL-ANBA', Lomeyko said: The issue of the Iraqi-Iranian war was not discussed at the Geneva summit on this level [as received]; moreover, the Soviet Union's position on the war has been well-known and clear since the early days of the war.

Commenting on the view that the Middle East is nothing more than a playing field for the game of nations between the two superpowers, Lomeyko said: These claims are not serious and have no truth in them or foundation. Our country has not and will not take part in such a game. We treat the issue of international relations and the problems that exist or emerge in various parts of the world, including the Middle East, seriously. He stressed: We do not take part in games like this, and we support relations of equal and mutual respect with all countries and peoples. We do not build our relations with great powers, including the United States, at the expense of the interests of other peoples. This is a firm polical principles as far as we are concerned.